



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,655	04/23/2002	Kari Hasanen	9926.1019	4257

21831 7590 05/08/2003

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.
1140 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, 15th FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036-5803

EXAMINER

KOYAMA, KUMIKO C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/980,655

Applicant(s)

HASANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Kumiko C. Koyama

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 .
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of receipt of Preliminary Amendment filed on April 23, 2002.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
3. The Applicants are reminded to include the following in the next communication with respect to the header(s) within the specification, as following:
 - a) **--Background of the Invention--**: The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts: **--Field of the Invention--** and **--Description of the Related Art--**.
 - b) **--Brief Summary of the Invention--**.
 - c) **--Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s)--**.
 - d) **--Detailed Description of the Invention--**.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 1-9: The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to eliminate all the reference numbers in the claims. For example, re claim 1: "A method in a machine (20) for..." should be changed to --A method in a machine for--. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to make all subsequent changes.

Re claims 1-9: The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to avoid the use of "can" because it renders the claim indefinite. For example, re claim 1, line 9: "...in which memory unit (2) can be written and which can be read electrically, by magnetization or optically" perhaps should be changed to --in which memory unit is electrically or optically read and written by magnetization--. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to make all subsequent changes.

Re claim 1, line 1: "a machine for producing or finishing/converting paper/board or pulp" should be changed to --a machine for producing, finishing, or converting paper, board or pulp--.

Re claim 1, line 2: "comprising" should be changed to --comprising:--.

Re claim 1, lines 3, 4 and 6: "-monitoring" should be changed to --monitoring--. ("-" deleted)

Re claim 1, lines 4: The following lack antecedent basis.

"the changes" should be --changes--.

"the ambient" should be changed to --ambient--.

Re claim 1, line 6: "the control unit" should be changed to --a control unit--.

Re claim 1, line 7: "[characterized in that the method further comprises the steps of]" should be deleted because it has been indicated as a removed portion according to the mark-up version of the amendment.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claim 1, line 8: "the component" should be changed to --a component--.

Re claim 1, line 12: "the control values" should be changed to --control values--.

"the manufacture or servicing" should be changed to --a manufacture or servicing--.

Re claim 1, line 14: The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to provide uniform spacing at "taken to be" portion.

Re claim 1, line 14: "the paper/board or pulp or finishing/converting machine" should be changed to --the machine--.

Re claim 1, line 17: "the paper/board or pulp or finishing/converting machine" should be changed to --the machine--.

"the separate data processing system" should be changed to --a separate data processing system--.

Re claim 3, line 2: "the state" should be changed to --a state--.

Re claim 5, line 2: "the changes" should be changed to --changes--.

Re claim 5, line 3: "the control unit" should be changed to --a control unit--.

Re claim 5, line 8: "the control values" should be changed to --control values--.

Re claim 5, line 9: "the manufacture or servicing" should be changed to --a manufacture or servicing--.

Re claim 7, line 1: The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to eliminate the comma in "the, component."

Re claim 7, line 2: "the state" should be changed to --a state--.

Re claim 7, line 2: "andlor" should be changed to --and/or--.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claim 8: The term "the" should be eliminated from all the following phrases due to lack of antecedent basis: "the information" (line 1), "deflection of the mantle" (line 3), "the composition" (line 3), "the surface material" (line 4).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "this stored data" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to clarify in the claims the meaning and content of "this stored data" because "this stored data" can either point to the stored properties, the stored changes or some other data that the Applicant is trying to claim or introduce. Also, if the "this stored data" and "the data stored" (line 16) are same, the examiner requests the Applicant to make the two phrases uniform for clarification purposes.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "them" in line 5. The examiner is unclear what is meant by "them" and requests the Applicant to clearly state what includes "them."

8. Claim 5 recites the limitation "them" in lines 2 and 3. The examiner is unclear what is meant by "them" and requests the Applicant to clearly state what includes "them."

9. Claim 5 recites the limitation "this data" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to clarify in the claims the meaning and content of "this data" because "this data" can either point to the stored

Art Unit: 2876

properties, the stored changes or some other data that the Applicant is trying to claim or introduce.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrala et al (US 5,381,341).

Herrala teaches a control system 100 for a paper or board machine provided with a feedback branch, wherein the properties of the web W, e.g. its transverse thickness profile, are measure by means of a transversing measurement detector 15 or a corresponding series of detectors, placed after the drying section, and by means of a corresponding measurement beam 18 fitted after a calender, in connection with which beam there may be also measurement of the transverse smoothness profile or equivalent of the web W (col 5, lines 21-31). The control system controls the series of the various actuators through the connections c1, c2, c3 and c4, said series comprising the actuator controllers. The data on the positions and status of the various actuators are also transferred through the connections c1, c2, c3 and c4 to the control system 100 (col 5, lines 57-51). The actuator controllers 42, serving as a component, includes a processor part with a memory section 55-57 and control part 51, serving as the control unit (col 6, lines 55-59). The memory section 55-57 includes a program memory 55 for storing a program (col 10,

Art Unit: 2876

lines 17-22), a data memory 56 and EEPROM 57 stores the scaling coefficient of the measurement as well as the operation point of the measurement (col 7, lines 13-20). The communication between the network server 40 and the actuator controllers 42 take place with the question-reply principle (col 7, lines 48-51) through RS 422 connection (col 7, lines 34-36). An actuator replies to a question message except in situations of error, in which case the actuator transmits a reject message to the service unit (col 7, lines 59-62). The actuator controllers 42 communicate with the process computer/process station by the intermediate of the RS422-interface 53. By means of message communications taking place along the connection 53, the set values are transmitted to the actuator and the actuator controllers executes accordingly (col 8 lines 27+). The actuator consists a position detector, serving as a sensor (col 3, lines 25).

Herrala does not specifically disclose that the data, changes and control values are stored in the memory.

However, Herrala teaches discloses a program memory 55, data memory 56 and EEPROM 57 storing the scaling coefficient of the measurement as well as the operation point of the measurement, which are all used as part of actuator making changes to the spindles. Herrala also teaches that the instructions and data are transmitted to the actuator, so that the actuator can provide the appropriate action. Such disclosure inherently teaches storing of the data, changes and control values in the memory unit of the actuators.

12. Claims 4 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrala as applied to claim 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Demeure (US 4,604,736). The teachings of Herrala have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Herrala fail to teach that the memory unit can be continuously sotred an amount of data, corresponding to a certain time interval, which is obtained in an essentially uninterrupted manner from at least on observing sensor.

Demeure teaches that memory stores a time interval T of the signal of each sensor (col 6, lines 54-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Demeure to the teachings of Herrala in order to make sure that the machine is operating in a functional manner without any errors by checking that the feed flow time of the paper is appropriate to insure that the paper is not jammed.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Adams et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,622,448, discloses a system and method of process control, particularly papermaking processes in response to fraction defective measurements.

Heaven et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,636,126, discloses a process for transforming a plurality of data points defining a high resolution profile for a parameter of a sheet material being manufactured into a low resolution profile for control of the parameter.

Beck, U.S. Patent No. 4,795,956, discloses a web motion converter.

Zingher et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,091,859, discloses a control system for a printing plant.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kumiko C. Koyama whose telephone number is 703-305-5425.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

kck
May 2, 2003


DIANE I. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER